



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/660,527	09/12/2003	Tetsuro Motoyama	241499US2CONT	5289

22850 7590 12/07/2005

OBLON, SPIVAK, MCCLELLAND, MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.
1940 DUKE STREET
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314

EXAMINER

PRIETO, BEATRIZ

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2142

DATE MAILED: 12/07/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/660,527	Applicant(s) MOTOYAMA ET AL.	
	Examiner Prieto B.	Art Unit 2142	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 26 September 2005.
 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-15 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-15 is/are rejected.
 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 12 September 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
 1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
 * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>10/26/05</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |



DETAILED ACTION

1. This communication is in response to Amendment filed 9/26/05, claims 1-3, 5-7, 9-11, have been amended, claims 1-15 remain pending.
2. Information Disclosure Statement (IDS) under 37 CFR 1.97 filed 10/26/05, comprising a list of applicant's pending application(s), published application(s) or issued patent(s) which may be related to the present application, has been considered, initialed and enclosed accordingly.

Double Patenting Rejection

3. Quotation of non-statutory double patenting rejection based on a judicially created doctrine may be found in previous office action.
4. Claims 1 and 3 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-15 of US 5,544,289 (referred to as patent '289 hereafter) in view of Barrett et. al. (US 5,935,262). Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because instant application is an obvious variation of the '289 patent.

Regarding claim 1, Motoyama teaches obtaining over the network by a first remote device which is the first remote device to obtain device information from the image handling device (claim 1 of the '289 patent claims transmitting semi-static data from a business office device to a computer, where the business office device is a copier/printer see claims 4/6 of the '289 patent respectively, receiving the semi-static state data to the remote computer see claim 7 of the '289 patent),

the device information including status information obtained from the image handling at device (see claim 7 of the '289 for receiving the semi-static state data at the remote computer), and a device identification of the image handling device (see claims 14 of the '289 patent claims receiving a model identification of the business office device and see claim 15 of the '289 patent claims receiving serial number of the business office device); however claims do not explicitly disclose where transmitted status information is obtained from sensors of the handling device and stored on the remote computer, processed to generate information and transmitting to a second computer.

Barrett teaches transmitting status information from a image handling device over the network to a first remote computer (col 1/lines 20-65), transmitting status information from the first remote computer to a second computer (col 5/lines 20-38), status information includes data that changes during the life of the image handling device (col 6/lines 31-45) including status information obtained from sensors (e.g.

detector or counters) (col 1/lines 44-50) and processing the stored (col 1/lines 51-55) device information by the first monitoring device or second monitoring device to generate a information based on the status information obtained over a period of time (col 11/lines 28-col 12/line 5, processing formatting obtained information to generate report, col 16/lines 25-40, col 12/lines 28-38). Barrett teaches the transmission of log file information based on a predetermined condition including inter alia when a predetermined time has been met, thereby periodically transmitting information to a computer (col 2/lines 1 1-26), the information including status information (col 25/lines 47-55), the processing and formatting in response to said predetermined condition obtained status information to generate report (Fig. 29 and col 35/lines 16-50).

It would have been obvious to one ordinary skilled in the art at the time the invention to periodically process and format status information for transmission to a computer by the device itself or by a computer as discussed by Barrett enabling the periodic transmission of status information base on predetermined condition such as when sufficient information is available or a memory capacity has been met, upon demand or in response to a predetermined time being met, set forth by Barrett.

Claim Rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103

5. Quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

6. Claims 1-3, 5-7 and 9-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mil (US 5,282,127) in view of Sekizawa (US 6,430,711).

Regarding claims 1, 5 and 9, Mil teaches an image-handling device (1) coupled to a network (6) (col 4/lines 20-29 and 45-58), the method comprising;

receiving over the network (6) by a first remote device (4), which is the first remote device to obtain device information from the image-handling device (1) (col 4/lines 22-29, 37-44, 45-58),

the device information including status information obtained from sensors (7) of the image handling at device (col 4/lines 59-col 5/line 5, col 6/lines 14-24), and a identification of the image-handling device (col 14/lines 36-42);

storing in storage means (234/232) of the first monitoring device (col 5/line 57-col 6/line 9), the obtained device information (col 10/lines 42-49, 56-65, storing received information col 15/lines 11-20);

processing by processing means (233) the stored device information by the first monitoring device to generate information (period usage report) is based on the status information obtained over a predetermined period of time (col 11/line 9-29, information including usage information col 12/line 60-col 13/line 5, obtained over time col 13/lines 27-37, usage information at a predetermined time, col 13/lines 46-51, and usage over a period of time col 13/lines 52-57), information includes usage information (col 14/lines 22-35, including identification of the image handling device col 14/lines 36-42);

processing by processing means includes generating usage information (col 15/lines 57-col 16/line 34); although Mil teaches obtaining by a device which is the first to obtain device information from a plurality of image handling devices over a network, it does not explicitly teach transmitting said information to a second device.

Sekizawa teaches receiving by a second device over a network information transmitted from a first device in obtaining over a network device information from an image-handling device. Specifically,

receiving by a second device (20) transmitting information over a network (6) from a first monitoring device (10) in receiving device information from a image-handling device (P) over a network (3) (col 2/lines 63-col 3/line 10, 14-18, 25-43, Fig. 1, col 18/lines 45-col 19/line 14);

receiving by the second device transmitted information including status information about the image handling device and storing in storage means said information (col 6/lines 36-48);

status information includes status information obtained by sensing means for sensing operational condition of the image handling device, e.g. remain amount information of the toner remaining amount, the ink remaining amount from the corresponding, i.e. identified printer (col 20/lines 51-57), where status information is obtained over a period of time (col 4/lines 32-50);

generating information (period usage report) status log (12) based on the status information obtained over a period of time (col 21/lines 9-20, 50-57, col 28/lines 44-67);

transmitted information to the second device includes device identifier and status information about the image-handling device (col 30/lines 24-35).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skilled in the art at the time the invention was made given the suggestion of Mil for monitoring image handling devices coupled to a network, the teachings of Sekizawa for remotely monitoring over a network a plurality of image handling devices coupled to a local network would be readily apparent. One would be motivated in combining the above mentioned teaches which would transmission of the usage report over the network from the first monitoring device in the Mil system to a second monitoring device receiving the usage report by the second monitoring device as taught in the Sekizawa system, reducing the cost of communication as stated by the latter. One would be motivated to combine these teachings for determining based on the usage

information when the image handling device require maintenance as noted by Sekizawa when discussing prior art because in doing so maintenance service may be dispatched efficiently to said device regardless of the number of device via described network low cost configuration for monitoring a number of image handling devices in a wide area range distributed in several remote sites, as disclosed by Sekizawa.

Regarding claim 2, transmitting the usage report to the second monitoring device, at a predetermined time or upon the occurrence of a predetermined event (Sekizawa: col 4/lines 44-51).

Regarding claim 3, wherein the image-handling device is a copier (Mil, Fig. 1), and the usage report includes a number of copies made by the copier over the predetermined period (Mil: col 4/lines 59-col 5/line 5 and col 6/lines 14-24).

Regarding claims 6-7, these system claims are substantially the same as the method claims 2-3, discussed above, same rationale of rejection is applicable.

Regarding claims 10-11, these computer program product claims are substantially the same as the method claims 2-3 and the system claims 6-7, discussed above, same rationale of rejection is applicable.

7. Claims 4, 8 and 12-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mil in view of Sekizawa in further view Danknick et. al. U.S. Patent No. 5,901,286 (Danknick hereafter)

Regarding claims 4, 8 and 12, however the above-mentioned reference(s) does not teach the use of HTML or Excel formats in its usage reports;

Danknick discloses as prior art accessing a network device by a computer to obtain the network device's status information including converting the obtained status information to an HTML format (col 1/lines 45-48), furthermore teaching relocatable software executing on a computer configured to translate information regarding status information associated with usage in a network device into a HTML format for rendering as a web page (col 10/lines 30-36) or other formats (col 12/lines 42-48).

It would have been obvious to one ordinary skilled in the art at the time the invention was made given the teachings of Hashimoto for monitoring a network device by accessing its status information a including displaying the obtained data received via modem telephone based network to include supporting the access to network device status information via a telephone network, motivation would be to further enhance Hashimoto's system with existing technology such as high speed digital

lines, e.g. high speed integrated digital network (ISDN) telephone lines enabling Web based monitoring functions as set forth by Danknick.

Regarding claims 13-15, report is generated on a monthly or weekly basis (Sekizawa: weekly, monthly or daily basis col 9/lines 45-57, Mil: col 10/lines 23-32).

Response to Arguments

8. Applicant argues (p. 8 of remarks) regarding non-statutory double patenting rejection based on a judicially created doctrine that claim 1 of the '289 patent fails to disclose (i) obtaining by a first monitoring status information from sensors of an image handling device. However, claim 1 of the '289 patent claims transmitting semi-static data from a business office device to a computer, where the business office device is a copier/printer (claims 4/6 of the '289 patent respectively), receiving the semi-static state data to the remote computer (claim 7 of the '289 patent), semi-static data is data of the copier that changes frequently; (ii) obtaining identification of an image handling device.

However, it is respectfully noted that claims 14 of the '289 patent claims receiving a model identification of the business office device and claim 15 of the '289 patent claims receiving serial number of the business office device and (iii) storing device information by the first monitoring device to generate a usage report of the image handling device, wherein the period usage report is based on the status information obtained over a predetermined period of time (Barrett; processing the stored device information by the first monitoring device or second monitoring device to generate a information based on the status information obtained over a period of time see col 11/lines 28-col 12/line 5. Barrett teaches the transmission of log file information based on a predetermined condition including inter alia when a predetermined time has been met, thereby periodically transmitting information to a computer see col 2/lines 1-26, the information including status information see col 25/lines 47-55, the processing and formatting in response to said predetermined condition obtained status information to generate report see Fig. 29 and col 35/lines 16-50).

9. Regarding claim 1 rejected under 35 USC 103 as being unpatentable over Barrett, it is argued the applied prior art fails to teach claim limitation as amended. Specifically, obtaining by a first monitoring device over the network and is the first to obtain device information from the image handling device.

In response to the above-mentioned argument, applicant's interpretation of the applied prior art has been fully considered. However the cited portion reads: The log file maintained by the network device

is conventionally *accessed using a computer. The computer can retrieve the log file via the LAN* and can format and display or print the log file or save the log file to a disk on a remote PC and then print the log file. Thereby, Barrett discloses obtaining by a first computer over a network, device information of at least one network device, and the device information including status information. The computer used to access the log file is the first computer to obtain the device information from the at least one network device (column 1, lines 51-65). The status information operational parameters and the like (column 1, lines 35-36), information related to image forming jobs received and the output to the image forming apparatus, statistical information related to the operation of the network device and/or status information and usage information for generating bills for the use of the network device, its maintenance or re-supply of resources used therein or diagnosing information (column 1, lines 40-50).

10. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

11. Reply to a final rejection or action must include cancellation of, or appeal from the rejection of, each rejected claim. If any claim stands allowed, the reply to a final rejection or action must comply with any requirements or objections as to form (see 1.113). If prosecution in an application is closed, an applicant may request continued examination of the application by filing a submission and the fee set forth in § 1.17(e) prior to the earliest of: (c) A submission as used in this section includes, but is not limited to, an information disclosure statement, an amendment to the written description, claims, or drawings, new arguments, or new evidence in support of patentability. If reply to an Office action under 35 USC 132 is outstanding, the submission must meet the reply requirements of § 1.111 (see MPEP 706.07).

12. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Prieto, B. whose telephone number is (571) 272-3902. The Examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 6:00 to 3:30 p.m. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the Examiner's Supervisor, Andrew T. Caldwell can be reached at (571) 272-3868. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3800/4700.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system, status information for published application may be obtained from either Private or Public PAIR, for unpublished application Private PAIR only (see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov> or the Electronic Business Center at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Hand carried or delivered to:

Customer Service Window located at the Randolph Bldg.
401 Dulany St.
Alexandria, VA 22314

Faxed to the Central Fax Office:

(571) 273-8300 (New Central Fax No.)

Or Telephone:

(571) 272-2100 for TC 2100 Customer Service Office.

B. Prieto
Primary Examiner
December 3, 2005

Beatriz Prieto
BEATRIZ PRIETO
PRIMARY EXAMINER